arXiv:1510.04089v2 [math.AG] 11 Feb 2016

Stability conditions on Fano threefolds of Picard number one

Chunyi Li

February 15, 2016

Abstract

We prove the conjectural Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequality for tilt slope stable objects on each Fano threefold X of Picard number one. Based on the previous works [1], [2] and [3] on Bridgeland stability conditions, this induces an open subset of geometric stability conditions on $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$. We also get a new stronger bound for Chern characters of slope semistable sheaves on X.

Keywords. stability condition, Fano threefolds, Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequality

Introduction

The notion of *stability conditions* on a $\mathbb{C}$-linear triangulated category was introduced by Bridgeland in [4]. The existence of stability conditions on three-dimensional complex varieties is considered to be one of the central open problem in the study of Bridgeland stability conditions. To construct family of geometric stability conditions on a smooth 3-fold, the general approach is to construct a new heart by tilting the original heart $\mathrm{Coh}(X)$ twice, and then impose suitable central charge function. Following this approach, the main technical difficulty, as revealed by the work [1] and [3], is to prove some conjectural Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequality that involves the third Chern character ch_3. In special cases when the variety admits a complete exceptional collection, the conjectural Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequality has been proved: the $\mathbf{P}^3$ case is set up in [9] by Macrì, and the quadric 3-fold case is solved in [10] by Schmidt. The abelian 3-fold of Picard number one case has been done in [7] and [8] by Maciocia and Piyaratne.

School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, University of Edinburgh
e-mail: Chunyi.Li@ed.ac.uk
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 14F05; Secondary 14J45

In the recent paper [2] by Bayer, Macrì and Stellari, the authors prove the existence of a stability condition for some 3-folds including all abelian 3-folds and Calabi-Yau 3-folds obtained as a finite quotient of an abelian 3-folds. In particular, as an important technical result, the authors show that when the polarization ω and the B-field B are proportional to each other, or in particular, when the Picard number of the variety is 1, the general version conjectural Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequality, Conjecture 2.4 in [2], is equivalent to the small limit version Conjecture 5.3. In this paper, we prove the Conjecture 5.3 in [2] for smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one.

Notations: Let X be a smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one. The Picard group, $\mathrm{Pic}(X)$, is generated by an ample divisor H. Let $\alpha > 0$ and β be two real numbers. We write $\mathrm{ch}_i^{\beta H}(E)$ for the βH-twisted i-th Chern character $\mathrm{ch}_i(E(-\beta H))$. Adopting the notation in [2], we write

$$\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X) := \langle \mathcal{T}_\beta(X), \mathcal{F}_\beta(X)[1] \rangle,$$

where $(\mathcal{T}_\beta(X), \mathcal{F}_\beta(X))$ is the torsion pair in $\mathrm{Coh}(X)$ given by:

$$\mathcal{T}_\beta(X) := \langle \text{ torsion sheaves; torsion-free slope stable sheaves } F \text{ with } \mathrm{ch}_1^{\beta H}(F) > 0 \rangle;$$
$$\mathcal{F}_\beta(X) := \langle \text{ torsion-free slope stable sheaves } F \text{ with } \mathrm{ch}_1^{\beta H}(F) \leq 0 \rangle.$$

The *reduced central charge* $\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is defined as follows:

$$\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}(E) = 3\alpha H^2 \mathrm{ch}_1^{\beta H}(E) + i\left(\sqrt{3}H\ \mathrm{ch}_2^{\beta H}(E) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\alpha^2 H^3 \mathrm{ch}_0^{\beta H}(E)\right).$$

When $\Re\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}(E) \neq 0$, the *tilt slope function* $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ is defined to be the slope $\frac{\Im\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}}{\Re\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}}$ of the reduced central charge. Otherwise, $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ is defined to be $+\infty$. An object E in $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X)$ is $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ *tilt-(semi)stable* if for all non-trial subobject $F \hookrightarrow E$ in $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X)$, one has $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) < (\leq)\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(E/F)$.

The real number $\overline{\beta}(E)$ is defined as

$$\overline{\beta}(E) = \begin{cases} \frac{H\ \mathrm{ch}_2(E)}{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E)} & \text{if } \mathrm{ch}_0(E) = 0, \\ \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) - \sqrt{\overline{\Delta}_H(E)}}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)} & \text{if } \mathrm{ch}_0(E) \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

We call an object $E \in D^b(X)$ to be $\overline{\beta}$-*stable* if there exists an open neighborhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of $(0, \overline{\beta}(E))$ such that for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in U$ with $\alpha > 0$, either E or $E[1]$ is a $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable object of $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(E)$.

Theorem 0.1 (Conjecture 5.3 in [2]). *Let X be a smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number 1, and $E \in D^b(X)$ be a $\overline{\beta}$-stable object, then*

$$\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}(E)H}(E) \leq 0.$$

By abuse of notations, we will write $\mathrm{ch}_i^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ instead of $\mathrm{ch}_i^{\overline{\beta}(E)H}(E)$ for short.

Combined with the results in [1] and [2], we get an open subset of *geometric stability conditions* on $\mathrm{Stab}(X)$. To make this precise, the second torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}, \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta})$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}(X) := \langle\ \nu_{\alpha,\beta}\text{ tilt-slope stable objects } F \in \mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X) \text{ with } \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) > 0\rangle;$$
$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}(X) := \langle\ \nu_{\alpha,\beta}\text{ tilt-slope stable objects } F \in \mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X) \text{ with } \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) \leq 0\rangle.$$

The heart $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta} := \langle \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta}(X), \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}[1]\rangle$ and the central charge $Z^{a,b}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is

$$\left(-\mathrm{ch}_3^\beta + bH\mathrm{ch}_2^\beta + aH^2\mathrm{ch}_1^\beta\right) + i\left(H\mathrm{ch}_2^\beta - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^\beta\right).$$

Here the coefficients a and b satisfy the inequality $a > \frac{\alpha^2}{6} + \frac{1}{2}|b|\alpha$.

Corollary 0.2. *The pair $(Z^{a,b}_{\alpha,\beta}, \mathcal{A}_{\alpha,\beta})$ is a geometric stability condition on $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$: skyscraper sheaves of points on X are stable with the same phase.*

The idea of the proof: The idea of the proof is based on two main observations. The first is to visualize the tilt slope function via the kernel of its reduced central charge. In this way, we may compare the $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-slope of tilt-stable objects by the 'positions' of their Chern characters and the kernel of $\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Based on this observation, when $0 < \overline{\beta}(E) < 1$, we have $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(mH), E) = 0$ for $m > 0$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}(mH)[1]) = 0$ for $m \leq 0$. Together with the Serre duality, we get inequalities such as $\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) \leq 0$.

The second observation is that the Todd classes of a Fano variety are 'positive' in some sense. Suppose $0 < \overline{\beta}(E) < 1$, then when we compute $\chi(O(H), E)$ or $\chi(O(2H), E)$ in terms of $H^{3-i}\mathrm{ch}_i^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$, the coefficients of $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ and $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ are expected to be non-negative. Together with the first observation, we get a bound for $\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$.

This idea works almost directly for Fano 3-folds with index greater than or equal to two. In the index one case, the inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) \leq 0$ is not enough to give the claim, because the rest term in the expansion of $\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E)$, which involves $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ and $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$, may be negative. To solve this problem, we impose a stronger bound for the Chern characters of $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable objects. In particular, we get a new stronger bound for slope stable sheaves on Fano 3-folds of Picard number one:

Theorem 0.3 (Corollary 3.4)**.** *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard number one, then for any μ_H-slope stable coherent sheaf F on X, the pair $\widetilde{v}_H(F)$, which is $\left(1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}(F), \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}(F)\right)$, is not inside $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$.*

The region $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$ is defined in Definition 3.1.

Organization: In Section 1.1, we collect some classification results of smooth Fano 3-folds of Picard number one. We will actually use only the bound on the index and degree of Fano 3-folds but not any other details from the classification results. In particular, we compute the explicit Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula. In Section 1.2, we collect some notations for the stability conditions and set up the picture of the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane to compare slopes of objects. In Section 2, we prove the conjecture for Fano 3-folds of index 2. In Section 3, we give the proof for Theorem 0.3 and the main theorem in the index 1 case.

Other threefolds: Although it is possible to generalize the proof to all Fano 3-folds, several problems may appear in the general situation. For the higher Picard number case, Conjecture 5.3 in [2] does not imply the existence of an open subset of stability conditions. One needs to treat the case when the polarization and the B-field are not proportional. Even in the case that ω and B are both proportional to a divisor H, the second Todd class may not be parallel to H^2, therefore the term with $\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}_H}(E)$ may be negative and hard to control. Meanwhile, depending on $\overline{\beta}_H(E)$, there are few candidate sheaves F such that $\chi(F, E) \leq 0$. These facts will make the computation very complicated.

For a more interesting case, the Calabi-Yau threefold of Picard number one, one of the key point fails. Suppose $0 < \overline{\beta}(E) < 1$, by comparing the slope, we only have $\mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathcal{O}(H), E) = \mathrm{Hom}\,(E, \mathcal{O}[1]) = 0$, so $\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E)$ and other $\chi(F, E)$ may be positive.

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to Arend Bayer and Xiaolei Zhao for very useful comments on the proof of Proposition 3.2 and their kind help on revising the paper. The author would also like to thank Mingmin Shen, Kenny Wong for helpful conversations. The author is supported by ERC starting grant no. 337039 "WallXBirGeom".

1 Fano threefolds of Picard number one and Notations Recollection

In this section, we collect some known facts about smooth Fano 3-folds of Picard number one. For further details, we refer to [5, 6, 11].

Let X be a 3-dimensional smooth projective variety of Picard number one over $\mathbb{C}$. The Picard group has a unique *ample generator* H. The variety X is *Fano* in the sense that its anti-canonical divisor $-K_X$ is ample. The *index* of X, denoted by r, is the positive integer such that $-K_X = rH$. Let d be H^3, and we call it the *degree* of X. When the index of X is 1, d is an even number $2g-2$, where the positive integer g is called the *genus* of X.

1.1 Classification of Fano threefolds of Picard number one and HRR formula

The smooth Fano 3-folds of Picard number one have been completely classified in [6, 11]. The detailed list of Fano 3-folds requires some notations and properties that are not closely related to the argument in this paper. We only summarize the range of the index and degree, which plays an important role in our arguments.

Theorem 1.1 ([6])**.** *Let X be a smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one and other notations as above, then the index r is less than or equal to 4. In addition,*

- *if $r = 4$, then X is $\mathbf{P}^3$;*
- *if $r = 3$, then X is a quadric hypersurface in $\mathbf{P}^4$;*
- *if $r = 2$, then the degree d is a positive integer less than or equal to 5;*
- *if $r = 1$, then the degree d is a positive even integer less than or equal to 22, and d cannot be 20.*

Let E and F be objects in $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$, the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves on X. We write $\mathrm{ch}_i(E)$ for the i-th Chern character of E, $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The Euler character $\chi(E, F)$ is defined to be the alternating sum

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} (-1)^i \mathrm{hom}(E, F[i])$$

as usual, and $\chi(E) := \chi(\mathcal{O}, E)$. The Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula is crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.7.

Lemma 1.2 (Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula)**.** *Let X be a smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one, index r and degree d. The Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch formula is given as follows:*

- *$r = 4$: $X = \mathbf{P}^3$, $H = [\mathcal{O}(1)]$.*

$$\chi(E) = \mathrm{ch}_3(E) + 2H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E) + \frac{11}{6}H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E).$$

- $r = 3$*:* $X = Q \subset \mathbf{P}^4$*,* $H = [\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{P}^4}(1)|_Q]$.

$$\chi(E) = \mathrm{ch}_3(E) + \frac{3}{2}H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E) + \frac{13}{12}H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + \frac{1}{2}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E).$$

- $r = 2$*:* $H = -\frac{1}{2}K_X$.

$$\chi(E) = \mathrm{ch}_3(E) + H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E) + (\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{d})H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + \frac{1}{d}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E).$$

- $r = 1$*:* $H = -K_X$.

$$\chi(E) = \mathrm{ch}_3(E) + \frac{1}{2}H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E) + (\frac{1}{12} + \frac{2}{d})H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + \frac{1}{d}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E).$$

Proof. By the Hirzebruch-Riemann-Roch theorem, $\chi(E)$ can be written as $\mathrm{ch}_3(E) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{ch}_1(\mathcal{O}(-K_X))\mathrm{ch}_2(E) + a_2H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + a_3H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)$ for some coefficients a_2 and a_3. By the Kodaira vanishing theorem, $\mathrm{H}^i(X, \mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{H}^i(X, \mathcal{O}(-K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}(K_X)) = 0$, when $i \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}) = \hom(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}) = 1.$$

This implies $1 = a_3H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(\mathcal{O})$ and $a_3 = \frac{1}{d}$.

In order to compute a_2 when the index is greater than 1, by the Kodaira vanishing theorem again, we have

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}(-H)) = \chi\left(\mathcal{O}(K_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}\big((r-1)H\big)\right) = \hom(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(-H)) = 0.$$

Substitute this into the HRR formula, for instance, when $r = 2$:

$$0 = -\frac{H^3}{6} + H \cdot \frac{H^2}{2} - a_2H^2 \cdot (-H) + \frac{1}{d}H^3,$$

we get $a_2 = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{d}$. The $\mathbf{P}^3$ and quadric hypersurface cases can be solved in the same way.

When $r = 1$, by Serre duality, $\chi(\mathcal{O}(-H)) = -\chi(\mathcal{O}) = -1$. Substitute this value back to the HRR formula, we get $a_2 = \frac{1}{12} + \frac{2}{d}$. □

1.2 The space of tilt slope functions

In this section we recollect some notations of stability conditions and useful lemmas.

Let E be an object in $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$. We write $\mathrm{ch}_i^\beta(E)$ for the βH-twisted i-th Chern character $\mathrm{ch}_i(E(-\beta H))$. The H-slope $\mu_H(E)$ is defined as $\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)}$. The notations of tilt heart $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X)$, the reduced central charge $\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}$, tilt slope function $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$, tilt-stability and $\overline{\beta}$-stability are defined in the introduction. We denote the Grothendieck

group of $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$ as $\mathrm{K}(X)$. The $\mathbb{R}$-linear span of the Grothendieck group is $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(X) := \mathrm{K}(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$.

The character map $\overline{v}_H$ maps objects in $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$ to their degrees, which is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^4$:

$$\overline{v}_H(E) := \left(H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E), H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E), H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E), \mathrm{ch}_3(E)\right).$$

The map $\overline{v}_H$ factors through $\mathrm{K}(X)$. The reduced character map $\widetilde{v}_H$ maps some objects in $\mathrm{D}^b(X)$ to the real projective plane $\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$:

$$\widetilde{v}_H(E) := \left[H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E), H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E), H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E)\right] = \left(1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)}\right).$$

The map $\widetilde{v}_H$ is well-defined only when $(H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E),\ H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E),\ H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E))$ is non-zero. The last equality makes sense when $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is not on the line at infinity, in other words, when $\mathrm{ch}_0(E) \neq 0$. We call this image space $\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ the *projective* $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$*-plane* and $\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus \{\mathrm{ch}_0 = 0\}$ the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$*-plane.*

By *H-discriminant*, we denote

$$\overline{\Delta}_H(E) := (H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E))^2 - 2H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E);$$

note that $\overline{\Delta}_H$ factors via $\overline{v}_H$. The *reduced discriminant* is given by

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_H(E) := \left(\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)}\right)^2 - 2\frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)}.$$

It is well-defined when $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E) \neq 0$. It factors via $\widetilde{v}_H$ and is defined on the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane. We define $\widetilde{\Delta}_m$ as the parabola $\widetilde{\Delta}_H = m$ in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, and write $\widetilde{\Delta}_{<0}$ or $\overline{\Delta}_{<0}$ for the area $\widetilde{\Delta}_H < 0$.

Given a tilt slope function $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$, the kernel of its reduced central charge $\overline{Z}_{\alpha,\beta}$ in $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$ is independent of ch_3. The kernel is explicitly written as

$$\left\{w \in \mathrm{K}_{\mathbb{R}}(X) |\ H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(w) = \beta H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(w); \quad H\,\mathrm{ch}_2(w) = \frac{\alpha^2+\beta^2}{2}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(w)\right\}.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, we visualize $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ via the kernel of its reduced central charge in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, or explicitly, the point with coordinate $\left(1, \beta, \frac{\alpha^2+\beta^2}{2}\right)$. Now if P is a point in $\widetilde{\Delta}_{<0}$ in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, then there is a unique tilt slope function $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ whose kernel is P, and we denote it by ν_P. Let E be an object in $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X)$ such that $\overline{\Delta}_H(E) \geq 0$; the kernel of the formal reduced central charge $\overline{Z}_{0,\overline{\beta}(E)}$ in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane is the point on the curve $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ such

that its tangent line of $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ passes through $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$. Though there are two candidate tangent points, the point is uniquely determined as follows: when $\mathrm{ch}_0(E) \geq 0$, $\overline{\beta}(E)$ is less than β; when $\mathrm{ch}_0(E) < 0$, $\overline{\beta}(E)$ is greater than or equal to β.

When we use the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, we always assume that $\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}$ is the horizontal axis and $\frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}$ is the vertical axis. Let E and F be two objects in $D^b(X)$ with non-zero $\widetilde{v}_H$. Let $\nu_{\alpha,\beta} = \nu_P$ be a tilt slope function, we write L_{EF} (l_{EF}) for the straight line (segment) in the projective $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane across $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ and $\widetilde{v}_H(F)$; $L_{E\nu_{\alpha,\beta}}$ or L_{EP} for the line passing through $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ and P. We write $L_{E\pm}$ for the line passing through $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ and $(0,0,1)$. We write L_{E+} for the ray in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane from $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ to $(0,0,1)$ (upward direction) and L_{E-} for the ray from E to $(0,0,-1)$ (downward direction).



Cartoon: L_{EF} and $\overline{\beta}(F)$.

The following useful lemmas show the convenience for representing $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ by the kernel of its reduced central charge in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane. Their proofs follow immediately from the definitions.

Lemma 1.3. *Let ν_P be a tilt slope function with reduced central charge $\overline{Z}_P$. Let E and F be two objects in $\mathrm{Coh}_P(X)$ such that their Chern characters v and w are not 0, then*

$$\overline{Z}_P(E) \text{ and } \overline{Z}_P(F) \text{ are on the same ray}$$

if and only if v, w and P are collinear in the projective $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane.

Proof. $\overline{Z}_P(v)$ and $\overline{Z}_P(w)$ are on the same ray if and only if $\overline{Z}_P(av-bw)=0$ for some $a,b\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. This implies that v, w and $\mathrm{Ker}\overline{Z}_P$ are collinear in the $\left\{1,\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0},\frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane. □

Definition 1.4. *Let l^+_{PE} be the ray from P along L_{PE} to the direction that $\frac{\mathrm{ch}_1}{\mathrm{ch}_0}$ tends to positive infinity. See the figure below.*

Lemma 1.5. *Let P be a point in $\widetilde{\Delta}_{<0}$ in the $\left\{1,\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0},\frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, E and F be two objects in Coh_β. The inequality*

$$\nu_P(E)>\nu_P(F)$$

holds if and only if the ray l^+_{PE} is above l^+_{PF}.



Figure: compare slopes on the $\left\{1,\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0},\frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane

Lemma 1.6. *Let ν be a tilt slope function and F be a ν tilt-stable object, then for any tilt slope function τ on the line/wall $L_{F\nu}\bigcap\widetilde{\Delta}_{<0}$, F is also τ tilt-stable.*

The main theorem of this paper reads as follows.

Theorem 1.7. *Conjecture 5.3 in [2] holds for smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one: Let X be a smooth Fano 3-fold of Picard number one, and $E\in D^b(X)$ be a $\overline{\beta}$-stable object, then*

$$\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E)\leq 0.$$

2 Index 2 case

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.7 when the 3-fold has index 2.

Proof. Let E be a $\overline{\beta}$-stable object as in the Conjecture 5.3 in [2], we write $\overline{\beta}(E)$ as $\overline{\beta}$ for short. By Lemma 5.6 in [2], we may assume that $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is not on $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$. Replacing E by $E(mH)$ for suitable integer m, we may assume $0 \leq \overline{\beta} < 1$. By Proposition 3.10 in [2], the coherent sheaf $\mathcal{O}(H)$ is also $\nu_{\alpha,\overline{\beta}}$ tilt-stable for any $\alpha > 0$. Since the line segment $l_{\nu_{0,\overline{\beta}}\mathcal{O}(H)}$ is above the ray $l^+_{\nu_{0,\overline{\beta}}E}$ which is on the tangent line, by Lemma 1.5, the tilt slope $\nu_{\epsilon,\overline{\beta}}(\mathcal{O}(H)) > \nu_{\epsilon,\overline{\beta}}(E)$ for any positive ϵ small enough. We therefore have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(H), E) = 0.$$

The object $\mathcal{O}(-H)[1]$ is also $\nu_{\epsilon,\overline{\beta}}$ tilt-stable by Proposition 3.10 in [2]. By Lemma 1.5, $\nu_{\epsilon,\overline{\beta}}(\mathcal{O}(-H)[1]) < \nu_{\epsilon,\overline{\beta}}(E)$. It follows that

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}(-H)[1]) = 0.$$

When n is an even number, $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(H), E[n])$ can be non-zero only when n is 0 or 2 because X has dimension 3, and only $\mathrm{H}^0(E)$ and $\mathrm{H}^{-1}(E)$ might be non-zero. By Serre duality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) &\leq \hom(\mathcal{O}(H), E) + \mathrm{ext}^2(O(H), E)\\ &= \hom(\mathcal{O}(H), E) + \hom(E, \mathcal{O}(-H)[1]) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

By the HRR formula in Lemma 1.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq \chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) &= \mathrm{ch}_3(E) + \left(-\frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{d}\right)\mathrm{ch}_1\\ &= \mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \overline{\beta}H\mathrm{ch}_2^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6}\right)H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} + \overline{\beta}(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6})\right)H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E)\\ &= \mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6}\right)H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} + \overline{\beta}(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6})\right)H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E).\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\overline{\beta}(E)$, we have $\mathrm{ch}_2^{\overline{\beta}}(E) = 0$ and get the last equality. By the classification result Theorem 1.1, the degree $d \leq 5$. The coefficients of $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ and $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ are greater than 0. By the definition of $\overline{\beta}(E)$, when E is not on $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$, E is in $\mathrm{Coh}_{\overline{\beta}}(X)$, this implies $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0$. When $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0$ or $\overline{\beta} = 0$, we have

$$\left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6}\right)H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} + \overline{\beta}(\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{6})\right)H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0.$$

Hence, we have $\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \leq 0$ in these two cases.

When $0 < \overline{\beta} < 1$, due to a similar argument, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(2H), E) = \mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1]) = 0.$$

Again by Lemma 1.2 and $\mathrm{ch}_2^{\overline{\beta}}(E) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \chi(\mathcal{O}(2H), E) \\ &= \mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + (\overline{\beta} - 1)H\mathrm{ch}_2^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \\ &+ \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \overline{\beta} + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}\right) H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + (\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3})\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d}\right) H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E). \end{aligned}$$

As $d \leq 5$, the coefficient of $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ is greater than $\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \overline{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$. The derivative of $\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}\right)\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d}$ is $\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \overline{\beta} + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}$, and is nonnegative. When $\overline{\beta} = 1$, the function $\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}\right)\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d} = 0$. Hence $\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}\right)\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d} < 0$, when $\overline{\beta} < 1$. When $\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) < 0$, we have

$$\left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \overline{\beta} + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3}\right) H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} + (\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3})\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d}\right) H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \leq 0$ in all cases. □

Remark 2.1. *The case of* $\mathbf{P}^3$ *and quadric* 3*-fold in* $\mathbf{P}^4$ *has already been set up in [1, 9, 10] . The same argument we used for the index* 2 *case also works, the computation is simpler since there is no term with* d*. Details are left to the reader.*

3 Index 1 case

The index 1 case is more complicated. Because we do not have the inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}(2H), E) \leq 0$, the same argument as that in the index 2 case only gives partial results. To solve this problem, we need a stronger bound for $\left(\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right)$ of a tilt-stable object.

Definition 3.1. *Let* $m \geq 0$ *be a real number. The open region* R_m *is defined on the* $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$*-plane as the set of points above the curve* $\widetilde{\Delta}_m$*, and above tangent lines of the curve* $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ *at* $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O}(k))$ *for all* $k \in \mathbb{Z}$*.*



Figure: $R_{\frac{1}{10}}$ is the region above the broken curve between $\widetilde{\Delta}_{0\sim 0.1}$.

The following proposition provides a bound for Chern characters $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ of a $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable object E in the Fano 3-fold case. It is slightly stronger than the bound given by the Bogomolov inequality $\overline{\Delta}_H \geq 0$ for general varieties.

Recall that r is the index and d is the degree of the Fano 3-fold.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ be a tilt slope function and E be a $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable object, then $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane is not in $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$. If $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is on the boundary of $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$, then $\mathrm{ch}_0(E)$ is 1 or 2.*

The proof contains two steps. We first show that such kind of object E or $E[1]$ must be tilt-stable for every $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ (we actually only show this for certain F with the minimum $\overline{\Delta}_H$). Then by comparing the slopes and Serre duality, $\mathrm{Ext}^2(E,E) = 0$. This implies $\chi(E,E) \leq 1$. On the other hand, the bound of $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$ implies that $\chi(E,E) > 0$. Therefore, $\chi(E,E) = 1$, and this leads to contradiction to the HRR formula.

Proof. Consider all objects F with $\widetilde{v}_H(F) \in R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$ and for which there are $\alpha > 0$, β such that F is $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable. Within this set, let E be such that $\overline{\Delta}_H(E)$ is minimal.

Lemma 3.3. *The above object E does not become strictly tilt-semistable unless on the vertical wall L_{E+}.*

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Suppose E becomes strictly semistable on a wall $L_{\nu E}$ other than the vertical wall, then we get the filtration for E:

$$0 = E_0 \subset E_1 \subset \cdots \subset E_m = E$$

with ν tilt-stable factors $F_i = E_i/E_{i-1}$. In the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane, the reduced characters $\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$ are all on the line $L_{\nu E}$. Consider the $\mathbb{R}$-linear plane spanned by

$\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$'s and $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (the 'affine' image of $K_{\mathbb{R}}(X)$ under $\widetilde{v}_H$), the set $\overline{\Delta}_H = 0$ consists of two lines and cuts the plane into four components. All points $\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$ are in the same component of $\overline{\Delta}_{>0}$ as $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ (some can be on the boundary). As a vector, $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is the sum of all $\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$, the points $\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$'s are not on the same side to the ray of $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$. There exists an F_i such that the line segment l_{EF_i} is contained in $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$. Since $L_{\nu E}$ is not the vertical wall, by Corollary 3.10 in [2], $\overline{\Delta}_H(F_i)$ is strictly less than $\overline{\Delta}_H(E)$. But this contradicts the minimum property of $\overline{\Delta}_H(E)$. We conclude that E is ν tilt-stable for any ν on the same side of $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ to the vertical wall L_{E+}. □

Back to the proof of Proposition 3.2, on the vertical wall L_{E+}, we consider the filtration for $E[1]$ (or E when $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E) < 0$). If $E[1]$ (or E) is not stable, then due to argument in the lemma, it has a tilt-stable factor E' such that $\widetilde{v}_H(E') \in R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$. By the minimum assumption on $\overline{\Delta}_H$ and Corollary 3.10 in [2], E' and $E[1]$ have the same $\overline{\Delta}_H$, and $\widetilde{v}_H(E') = \widetilde{v}_H(E[1])$. Since the stability is an open condition, E' is ν tilt-stable for ν on a neighborhood to the right of $L_{E'+}$, and $E'[-1]$ is ν tilt-stable for ν on a neighborhood to the left of $L_{E'+}$. Since E' and $E'[-1]$ also have the minimum discriminant, by Lemma 3.3, either E' or $E'[-1]$ is $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable for any $\alpha > 0$.

We may assume that $E = E'[-1]$ and $H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E) > 0$. Since $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is above the tangent line of the curve $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ at $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O})$ and $\widetilde{v}_H\left(\mathcal{O}(rH)\right)$, the line segment $l_{EE(-rH)}$ intersects the cone $\widetilde{\Delta}_{<0}$, and there is a tilt slope function $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ with kernel below $l_{EE(-rH)}$. By Lemma 1.5, we have $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(E(-rH)[1]) < \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(E)$. Since both of them are $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$ tilt-stable, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, E(-rH)[1]) = 0.$$

By Serre duality, we have

$$\chi(E,E) \leq \hom(E,E) + \mathrm{ext}^2(E,E) = 1 + \hom(E, E(-rH)[1]) = 1.$$

On the other hand, by the HRR formula,

$$\chi(E,E) = -\frac{r}{2d}\overline{\Delta}_H(E) + \frac{1}{d}H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)\mathrm{ch}_0(E) > 0. \qquad (\blacksquare)$$

The last inequality is because of

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_H(E) < \frac{3}{2rd} < \frac{2}{rd} \text{ and } \overline{\Delta}_H(E) = \widetilde{\Delta}_H(E)\left(H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)\right)^2.$$

Hence, $\chi(E,E) = 1$. Substitute this into $(\blacksquare)$, we have the identity:

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_H(E) = \big(1 - \frac{1}{\mathrm{rk}(E)^2}\big)\frac{2}{dr} \geq \big(1 - \frac{1}{4}\big)\frac{2}{dr} = \frac{3}{2dr}.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is not in $\widetilde{\Delta}_{<\frac{3}{2dr}}$ and is on the boundary of $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$ only when $\mathrm{rk}(E)$ is 1 or 2.

□

Corollary 3.4. *Let X be a Fano 3-fold of Picard number one, then for any μ_H-slope semistable coherent sheaf F on X, $\widetilde{v}_H(F)$ is not inside $R_{\frac{3}{2rd}}$.*

Remark 3.5. *This kind of bound is trivial to prove in the Fano surface case, since in the surface case the* Ext^2 *vanishing is directly due to Serre duality. In the Fano 3-fold case, we need the concept of tilt stability condition.*

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.7 for the index 1 case.

Proof of the index one case. Let E be a $\overline{\beta}$-stable object as in the Theorem 1.1. We first consider the case that $\overline{\beta}$ is not an integer. For the same reason as that in the index two case, we may assume that $0 < \overline{\beta}(E) < 1$. By Lemma 5.6 in [2], we may also assume that $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is not on the cone $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$. As $0 < \overline{\beta} < 1$, by the same argument as that in the index two case, we still have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1]) = 0 \text{ and } \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(H), E) = 0.$$

By the same argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \geq & \chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) \\
= & \mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\mathrm{ch}_2^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \frac{\overline{\beta}}{2} + \frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12}\right) H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \\
& + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{4} + (\frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12})\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d}\right) H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \\
= & \mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \frac{\overline{\beta}}{2} + \frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12}\right) H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{6} - \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{4} + (\frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12})\overline{\beta} - \frac{1}{d}\right) H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E).
\end{aligned}$$

Let the function $f(x)$ be

$$\frac{x^3}{6} - \frac{x^2}{4} + \left(\frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12}\right)x - \frac{1}{d},$$

then the coefficient $\frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \frac{\overline{\beta}}{2} + \frac{2}{d} + \frac{1}{12}$ for $\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ is $f'(\overline{\beta})$. As $d \leq 22$, $f'(\overline{\beta})$ is greater than 0 for any real number $\overline{\beta}$. The coefficient for $H^3\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E)$ is $f(\overline{\beta})$, which is monotonically increasing with respect to $\overline{\beta}$. As $f(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$, in either one of the two subcases

- $\frac{1}{2} \leq \overline{\beta} < 1$ and $\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0$;
- or $0 < \overline{\beta} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \leq 0$;

we have $\mathrm{ch}_3^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \leq 0$.

We next show by contradiction that in the other subcases, $f'(\overline{\beta})H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + f(\overline{\beta})H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) \geq 0$. In the case when $0 < \overline{\beta} < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) > 0$, assume that

$$f'(\overline{\beta})H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E) + f(\overline{\beta})H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) < 0. \qquad (*)$$

Since $\overline{\beta}(E)$ is greater than 0, $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is not below the tangent line of the curve $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ at $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O})$. By the assumption (*) on E, we have

$$f'(\overline{\beta})H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E) + (-\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{3} + \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{4} - \frac{1}{d})H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E) < 0.$$

The tangent lines of $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ at $\tilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O})$ and $\tilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O}(H))$ in the $\left\{1, \frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}, \frac{H\,\mathrm{ch}_2}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}\right\}$-plane intersect at $(1, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$. Substitute $(H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E), H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E))$ by $\left(1, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}f'(\overline{\beta}) + -\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{3} + \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{4} - \frac{1}{d} = -\frac{\overline{\beta}^3}{3} + \frac{\overline{\beta}^2}{2} - \frac{\overline{\beta}}{4} + \frac{1}{24} > 0,$$

when $0 < \overline{\beta} < \frac{1}{2}$. As $f'(\overline{\beta}) > 0$, the left hand side of (*) is not less than 0 when $\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0(E)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, the point $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ has $\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0}$-coordinate less than $\frac{1}{2}$ and is above the tangent line of $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ at $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O}(H))$.



Cartoon: $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is above the tangent lines at $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O})$ and $\widetilde{v}_H(\mathcal{O}(H))$.

Consider the function $g(x) := \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}f'(x) + f(x)$, we have

$$g(0) = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}\Big(\frac{1}{12} + \frac{2}{d}\Big) - \frac{1}{d} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}\Big(\sqrt{\frac{2}{d}} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\Big)^2 > 0.$$

The derivative of $g(x)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} g'(x) &= \frac{x^2}{2} - \Big(\frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}\Big)x + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{2}{d} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}} \\ &\geq g'\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}\Big) = -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}}\Big)^2 + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{2}{d} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{3}{2d}} \\ &= \frac{5}{4d} - \frac{1}{24} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is because of $d \leq 22$. Therefore, $g(x) > 0$, when $x > 0$. Since $f'(x) > 0$, this implies $\left(\frac{f(x)}{f'(x)}\right)^2 < \frac{3}{2d}$. Now we may estimate the reduced discriminant of E:

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_H(E) = \widetilde{\Delta}_H^{\overline{\beta}}(E) = \left(\frac{H^2\mathrm{ch}_1^{\overline{\beta}}(E)}{H^3\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E)}\right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{-f(\overline{\beta})}{f'(\overline{\beta})}\right)^2 < \frac{3}{2d}.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$ is in $R_{\frac{3}{2d}}$, this leads the contradiction to Proposition 3.2. The rest case when $\frac{1}{2} < \overline{\beta} < 1$ and $\mathrm{ch}_0^{\overline{\beta}}(E) < 0$ is proved in the same way.

We now treat with the case that $\overline{\beta}(E)$ is an integer. We may assume that $\overline{\beta}(E) = 0$.

If $\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1]) = 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}(H), E) \leq 0$ and by the same argument as above, this will imply $\mathrm{ch}_3(E) \leq 0$. If $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, E) = 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}, E) \leq 0$ and by a similar argument as above, this will imply $\mathrm{ch}_3(E) \leq 0$. Therefore, $\mathrm{ch}_3(E) > 0$ implies both $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, E) \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1]) \neq 0$.

Suppose there exists a $\overline{\beta}$-stable object E such that $\overline{\beta}(E) = 0$ and $\mathrm{ch}_3(E) > 0$, among all such objects, we assume that E has the minimum discriminant $\overline{\Delta}_H$, in other words, E has the minimum $|H^2\mathrm{ch}_1|$. By taking the derived dual $\mathrm{R}\mathcal{H}om(E, \mathcal{O})[1]$ if necessary, we may assume that $\mathrm{ch}_0(E) \geq 0$. There is a negative number c such that for any $c < \beta < 0$, E and $\mathcal{O}$ are both in the heart $\mathrm{Coh}_\beta(X)$. By assumption, there exists a non-zero ι in $\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1])$ inducing a non-trivial extension F of E by $\mathcal{O}$. The extension F does not depend on the choice of β.

Lemma 3.6. *The object F constructed as above is $\overline{\beta}$-stable.*

Proof of Lemma 3.6. We first show that the object F is in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$. For any H-slope stable sheaf G such that $\mu_H(G) \leq 0$, $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, G) \neq 0$ only when $G = \mathcal{O}$. Since E is in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$, $\mathrm{Hom}(E, G) = 0$. But since ι is non-zero, $\mathrm{Hom}(F, \mathcal{O}) = 0$. Apply $\mathrm{Hom}(-, G)$ to the exact triangle

$$\mathcal{O} \to F \to E \xrightarrow{+} \qquad (\bigstar)$$

we get $\mathrm{Hom}(F, G) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathrm{H}^0(F)$ has no quotient object with non-positive μ_H slope. Since $\mathrm{H}^{-1}(F)$ is the kernel of $\mathrm{H}^{-1}(E) \to \mathcal{O}$ and E is in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$, it has no subobject with positive slope. By the definition of $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$, F is in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$.

Assume that F is not $\overline{\beta}$-stable, then there is a filtration of F:

$$0 = F_0 \subset F_1 \subset \cdots \subset F_m = F$$

in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$ such that for any α small enough, each factor $K_i := F_i/F_{i-1}$ is $\nu_{\alpha,0}$ tilt-stable and $\nu_{\alpha,0}(K_{i+1}) \leq \nu_{\alpha,0}(K_i)$. As $\mathcal{O}[1]$ and F_i are in a same heart $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$,

$$\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, \mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{Hom}(F_i, (\mathcal{O}[1])[-1]) = 0.$$

Since $\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, F) \neq 0$ and F is the extension of E by $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathrm{Hom}(F_i, E) \neq 0$. Since E is $\overline{\beta}$-stable,

$$\nu_{\alpha,0}(F) \leq \nu_{\alpha,0}(F_i) \leq \nu_{\alpha,0}(E)$$

for α small enough. By Lemma 1.5 and the inequalities above, $\widetilde{v}_H(F_i)$ is well-defined and has to be on the line segment l_{EF}. Therefore, $\mathrm{ch}_2(K_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. By the definition of $\overline{\beta}$, $\overline{\beta}(K_i) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. By Lemma 1.6 and the definition of $\overline{\beta}$-stable, each K_i is $\overline{\beta}$-stable.

Since $H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(K_i) \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \mathrm{ch}_1(K_i) = \mathrm{ch}_1(F)$, $0 \leq H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(K_i) \leq H^2\mathrm{ch}_1(F)$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since $\sum_i \mathrm{ch}_3(K_i) = \mathrm{ch}_3(F) = \mathrm{ch}_3(E) > 0$, there exists K_i with positive ch_3. By the minimum assumption on $|H^2\mathrm{ch}_1|$ of E, the only possible case is that $\mathrm{ch}_1(K_l) = \mathrm{ch}_1(E)$ for an l and $\mathrm{ch}_1(K_i) = 0$, $\mathrm{ch}_3(K_i) \leq 0$ when $i \neq l$. K_l mush be the first factor $K_1(= F_1)$ since otherwise $\widetilde{v}_H(F_1)$ is at the origin and is not on the line segment l_{EF_i}. Since $\mathrm{ch}_1(F_1) = \mathrm{ch}_1(E) = \mathrm{ch}_1(F)$ and $\mathrm{rk}(F) - \mathrm{rk}(E) = 1$, $\widetilde{v}_H(F_1)$ is either the same as $\widetilde{v}_H(F)$ or $\widetilde{v}_H(E)$. If $\widetilde{v}_H(F_1) = \widetilde{v}_H(F)$, then either F is $\overline{\beta}$-stable or $\nu_{\alpha,0}(F_1) \geq \nu_{\alpha,0}(F/F_1) = +\infty$, either case will lead to a contradiction. If $\widetilde{v}_H(F_1) = \widetilde{v}_H(E)$, then since E and F_1 are both $\overline{\beta}$-stable, this can happen only when $F_1 \hookrightarrow E \to C$ in $\mathrm{Coh}_0(X)$ and the cokernel C is zero or a sheaf supported on dimension 0. Since $\mathrm{ch}_3(K_i) \leq 0$ when $i > 1$, $\mathrm{ch}_3(F_1) \geq \mathrm{ch}_3(E)$. Therefore F_1 must be E. Now apply $\mathrm{Hom}(F_1, -) = \mathrm{Hom}(E, -)$ to the vanishing triangle ($\bigstar$), we get the exact sequence:

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Hom}(E, F) \to \mathrm{Hom}(E, E) \to \mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1]).$$

Since $\mathrm{Hom}(E, E) = \mathbb{C}$ and the image of its identity in $\mathrm{Hom}(E, \mathcal{O}[1])$, which is ι, is nonzero, E is not a subobject of F. This leads to the contradiction, and F is $\overline{\beta}$-stable.

□

Back to the proof of the main theorem: The Chern characters of F are $(\mathrm{ch}_0(E)+1, \mathrm{ch}_1(E), 0, \mathrm{ch}_3(E))$. Since F still satisfies the minimum assumption on $|\mathrm{ch}_1(F)|$, by Lemma 3.6, we may construct a sequence of $\overline{\beta}$-stable objects with Chern characters

$$(\mathrm{ch}_0(E) + n, \mathrm{ch}_1(E), 0, \mathrm{ch}_3(E)) .$$

When $n \gg 0$, this character is on the boundary of $R_{\frac{3}{2d}}$, this leads the contradiction to Proposition 3.2. □

References

[1] A. Bayer, A. Bertram, E. Macrì, and Y. Toda. Bridgeland stability conditions of threefolds II: An application to Fujita's conjecture. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 23(4):693–710, 2014.

[2] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, and P. Stellari. Stability conditions on abelian threefolds and some Calabi-Yau threefolds. 2014.

[3] A. Bayer, E. Macrì, and Y. Toda. Bridgeland stability conditions on threefolds I: Bogomolov-Gieseker type inequalities. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 23(1):117–163, 2014.

[4] T. Bridgeland. Stability conditions on triangulated categories. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(2):317–345, 2007.

[5] S. D. Cutkosky. On Fano 3-folds. *Manuscripta Math.*, 64(2):189–204, 1989.

[6] V. A. Iskovskikh and Y. G. Prokhorov. Fano varieties. In *Algebraic geometry, V*, volume 47 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 1–247. Springer, Berlin, 1999.

[7] A. Maciocia and D. Piyaratne. Fourier-mukai transforms and bridgeland stability conditions on abelian threefolds, 2013. *arXiv:1304.3887*.

[8] A. Maciocia and D. Piyaratne. Fourier-mukai transforms and bridgeland stability conditions on abelian threefolds ii, 2013. *arXiv:1310.0299*.

[9] E. Macrì. A generalized Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for the three-dimensional projective space. *Algebra Number Theory*, 8(1):173–190, 2014.

[10] B. Schmidt. A generalized Bogomolov-Gieseker inequality for the smooth quadric threefold. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 46(5):915–923, 2014.

[11] M. Shen. *Rational curves on Fano threefolds of Picard number one*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2010. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Columbia University.